

II. REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending. The Applicants' attorney has amended claims 1-10, 12-14, 19-20, and 22 and has added new claims 23-25. But none of these amendments narrow the claims. In light of the following, all of the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance, and, therefore, the Applicants' attorney requests the Examiner to withdraw all of the outstanding rejections. But if after considering this response the Examiner does not allow all the claims, the Applicant's attorney requests that the Examiner contact him to schedule a teleconference to further the prosecution of the application.

Priority Document

The Applicants' attorney encloses a certified priority document for European Patent Application No. 02425510.1. The Applicants' attorney previously submitted the priority document for European Patent Application No. 02425509.3, and the Examiner has acknowledged receipt of this latter priority document.

Incorporation Of Material In The Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification as incorporating essential material from the foreign priority documents, European Patent Application Nos. 02425510.1 and 02425509.3. But because the material within these documents is cumulative to the material disclosed in the patent application as filed, the material within these documents is not essential to the patent application. Furthermore, incorporation of a non U.S. Patent document by reference for nonessential material is permitted. Consequently, incorporation of the above-listed foreign priority documents is proper.

Objection To The Drawings

The Applicants' attorney has added the legend "Prior Art" to FIG. 1 as requested by the Examiner, and encloses a replacement sheet of drawings that includes FIG. 1 as amended.

Objection To Claim 12

The Applicants' attorney has amended claim 12 to overcome this objection, and has amended claims 13-14 in a similar manner.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, and 10-22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) As Being Anticipated By Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (FIG. 1)

As discussed below, the Applicants' attorney disagrees with this rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites control means capable of prolonging the switch-on time period of a power transistor at the instants of time wherein an alternating network voltage substantially takes on the value zero.

For example, referring to FIGS. 4-6B and paragraphs 37-40 of the patent application, a circuit 200 prolongs the on time of the power transistor M when the amplitude of the sinusoidal input voltage V_{in} is near its crossover points, *i.e.*, zero volts. By increasing the on time of the transistor M during these crossover periods of V_{in} , the inductor L can provide more current to the load during these periods, thus reducing distortion and more evenly distributing the load on the network that provides V_{in} . More specifically, the circuit 200 prolongs the on time of the transistor M by generating a discharge current I_d , which slows the charge rate of capacitor C, and thus increases the time before the voltage across C exceeds S_e and causes the flip-flop 11 to turn off the transistor M.

In contrast, the control device of FIG. 1 is incapable of prolonging the on time of a power transistor at the instants of time wherein an alternating network voltage substantially takes on the value zero. Referring to FIG. 1 and paragraphs 4-18 of the patent application, the control device 1 is incapable of prolonging the on time of the transistor M when the amplitude of Vin is near its crossover points, *i.e.*, zero volts. That is, under a steady-state load condition, the control device 1 causes the on time of the transistor M to be constant regardless of the amplitude of Vin.

Claim 10

This claim is patentable by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Claim 11

Claim 11 recites a distortion-reducing circuit operable to lengthen the on period of a power transistor while an input signal is within a predetermined amplitude range.

In contrast, as discussed above, the control device 1 of FIG. 1 is incapable of lengthening the on period of the transistor M while Vin is within a predetermined amplitude range.

Claims 12-16

These claims are patentable by virtue of their dependencies on claim 11.

Claims 17-19

These claims are patentable for reasons similar to those recited above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

Claims 20-22

These claims are patentable by virtue of their dependencies on claim 19.

Double Patenting

The Applicants' attorney traverses this rejection, and will file a more complete response to this rejection if and when this rejection becomes non-provisional.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, claims 11, 15-18, and 21 as previously pending, claims 1-10, 12-14, 19-20, and 22 as amended, and new claims 23-25 are in condition for full allowance, which is respectfully requested.

In the event additional fees are due as a result of this amendment, payment for those fees has been enclosed in the form of a check. Should further payment be required to cover such fees you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

If the Examiner believes that a phone interview would be helpful, he is respectfully requested to contact the Applicant's attorney, Bryan Santarelli, at (425) 455-5575.

DATED this 3rd day of February, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

Bryan A. Santarelli
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,560
155 – 108th Ave. NE, Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575

In the Drawings:

Please replace the attached **FIG. 1** labeled Replacement Sheet with the originally filed **FIG. 1**. This Replacement Sheet includes the "(PRIOR ART)" indicator.